

REMARKS

The Amendments

The claims are amended to direct them to the subject matter which appears to be indicated as in condition for allowance. The rejected compound claims are cancelled and applicants reserve the right to seek this subject matter in a divisional application. Claim 26 is amended to render moot the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection based on lack of antecedent basis. The amendments do not narrow the broadest scope of the claims and/or are not made for purposes of patentability. The broadest method claim, i.e., claim 22 remains of the same scope, thus, the subject matter of the broadest methods was not narrowed. The amendment to claim 26 is not narrowing since it depended on claim 22 and could not be broader than claim 22.

It is submitted that the above amendments would put the application in condition for allowance. The amendments do not raise new issues or present new matter and do not present additional claims. The amendments have been made to direct the claims to what appears to be allowable subject matter, i.e., the claims already indicated to be allowable and claim 26 for which the sole rejection thereof has been rendered moot. These amendments were not earlier presented because the allowable subject matter was first indicated in the Final action. Accordingly, it is submitted that the requested amendments should be entered.

Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuing and/or divisional applications directed to any subject matter disclosed in the application which has been canceled by any of the above amendments.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The rejection of claims 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is believed to be rendered moot by the amendment to the claim. The claim is amended to remove the language which was alleged to lack antecedent basis and form the basis for the rejection. Thus, the rejection should be overcome.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claims 13-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

Claim Objection

The objection to claims 18 and 19 as being substantial duplicates is rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims.

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. But the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any unresolved matters.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Sopp/

John A. Sopp, Reg. No. 33,103
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: 01-2118

Date: April 19, 2011

JAS:dap